DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 538 SP 015 705

AUTHOR Eidell, Terry L.
TITLE Educational R & D: A Role for Leadership in Professional Associations.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 21p.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Dallas, TX, February 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperation; Educational Development; *Educational Research; Intergroup Relations; *Professional Associations; *Program Effectiveness; *Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS Linkage; *Research Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

The role of professional associations in providing linkage between educational researchers and educational practicioners is discussed. The difficulties involved in coordinating two essentially discrete and insular educational communities--the research community and the practicing educational community--are described, and an overview of the traditional relationship between the two is provided. The role of an association is seen as fundamentally informative. The need to inform association members of practical educational research and development (R&D), and the need to inform public policy-makers of the realities behind educational practice, are both met by an association's linking function. Also, a more accurate portrayal of the needs and problems of education in general is provided to decision-makers. The association is also seen as a supporting mechanism for basic R&D technology development. The author argues for a "rapprochement" of the research and practitioner communities, rather than for an integration per se. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183538

EDUCATIONAL R & D: A ROLE FOR LEADERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS*

by

Terry L. Eidell, Director
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Terry L. Eidell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP015705

*This paper was prepared for presentation on February 28, 1980, at the annual meeting of AACTE.

Introduction

As I approached writing this paper, I found that the topic given was deceptively simple. At first blush, it seemed to present a challenge that could be addressed in a straightforward manner. However, as I got deeper into my task, I found that at least one unspoken assumption implied in the topic had to be addressed. That was, what would be the purpose of any role for professional associations vis a vis educational R & D? Many purposes might be imputed, but I decided the most reasonable assumption was that such role would have to ultimately result in facilitating the improvement of educational practice through the technology of R & D. This assumption, while innocent enough in itself, led me on a merry chase. For now, instead of confronting the question of appropriate roles for professional associations vis a vis educational R & D, I was faced with the complexity of dealing with what is known about the relationship between educational practice and educational R & D.

I recalled a statement David Clark made in 1963:

> Research seems unable to find an appropriate place in the field of education. Practitioners have not used research as a basis for their operations. The pathes to school improvement have been directed toward the provision of more of what already exists... and the improvement of practice on the basis of what is already known.

Following this assertion, Clark continued his observation by identifying as the "real problem" the lack of a mechanism (or mechanisms) which would integrate educational R & D and educational practice into a total educational process (Clark, 1963, p. 9).

Assuming the veracity of Clark's 1963 observations, I began to wonder whether, and/or to what degree, the mechanisms of integration which Clark foresaw more than 15 years ago had been achieved. Certainly, educational practice continues to function as an institution of our social establishment. And much has been

written recently to attest to the maturity being achieved in educational R & D. Examples of the latter are Schutz' recent description of the eras through which educational R & D has progressed since the 1890's (Schutz, 1979), and the Sharp and Frankel findings which provide a first comprehensive demography of educational R & D (Sharp and Frankel, 1979). However, when one observes the broad field of education, it seems clear that a need still exists. In other words, what Clark identified in 1963, as the real problem of improving educational practice through the technology of R & D, may persist to this day as the seminal problem in school improvement!

Now, I thought, if my assessment of the situation is reasonable, the locus of important roles for professional associations is identified. All I have to do is spell out how professional associations might take leadership in solving this problem. And, in fact, that is the focus of this paper. However, I have found this task more complicated than it may appear.

Upon reflection, this longstanding problem of linkage seems to elicit more questions than answers. In 1965 the U. S. Congress sought to solve this problem. With passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a network of new organizations--Regional Educational Laboratories--was created as a mechanism for solution. I believe that those Laboratories that have survived to this time, in fact, have impacted the problem in positive ways. Yet the problem of improving education through R & D technology seems to persist. It is apparently a problem for which there is no easy solution. Therefore, I find that any consideration of how professional associations might effect meaningful impact on this problem is necessarily very complex.

In this paper, then, I have attempted to explore at least some of the more salient features of the problem's context. From this exploration, I have drawn

a number of conclusions relevant to its solution. Finally, I have tried to explicate some key roles, which I believe might be undertaken by professional associations.

What is the Problem Context?

Several years ago, in an attempt to clarify the role of Regional Educational Laboratories and similar organizations, I portrayed the problem that Clark addressed by positing the existence of two discrete and relatively insular communities in education (Eidell, 1977). These communities were identified as the community of educational R & D and the community of educational practice. My contention, that these communities exist as two separate and relatively isolated parts that make up the larger education enterprise, was supported on the basis of organizational norms, which naturally accrue as a result of purpose and function. The argument presented was as follows:

> State education agencies, intermediate education agencies, local schools, and higher education departments of instruction are all designed to optimize the control and delivery of education to student-clients. The norms and reward systems, both formal and informal, of such organizations are necessarily designed to ensure that control and delivery of education to clients remain uppermost goals of these organizations. These organizations are, therefore, necessarily characterized as bureaucratic and oriented toward maintaining predictable stability.
>
> Organizations, groups, and individuals of the research community are motivated to optimize the pursuit of knowledge through systematic, scientific study. The rigors of the scientific disciplines so important to the advancement of scientific knowledge necessarily impose upon the R & D community norms and reward systems which optimize and support a social enclave devoted to such scholarship.

This bimodal distribution of educators into the two discrete communities of educational practice and educational R & D is seldom depicted directly in the literature, but I believe it is implicit in much that we read. For example, Kerlinger, in his statement of "The Influence of Research on Educational Practice," stresses

how necessary it is to maintain the system of values underlying scientific inquiry if educational research is to be meaningfully fostered (Kerlinger, 1977). My interpretation of this and much other literature is that: (a) the communities of educational practice and educational R & D so exist, and (b) these two communities cannot be merged as a means of integrating the larger enterprise of education if instruction and research are to be properly and productively executed.

Much time has been devoted here to develop and defend a conception of the education enterprise in this nation as being composed of two discrete and relatively insular communities. Possibly, this conception of the educational world is erroneous; in that case, both what has been said and the implications and conclusions which follow are worthless. Possibly, what I have said to this point is well known and agreed upon; in that case, I have belabored the obvious. But just possibly, the foregoing is accurate and worth explication. Assuming either of these latter possibilities, it seems worthwhile to consider how this conception of education serves as a basis for thinking about improving education through R & D. Further, this will permit us to consider appropriate roles of education professional associations in fostering such improvement.

If the education profession has two discrete branches--one oriented to instructional practice and the other oriented to scientific study--real success in improving practice through R & D will only occur as a meaningful rapprochement between those communities is achieved. I have chosen deliberately to describe the desired future state as one of rapprochement. For if the conception of the two educational communities is accurate, we are dealing with the reality of how these communities developed and exist--separate by the very nature of their being. Therefore, the most fruitful state we can hope to achieve is not one of total integration; it is, instead, one in which each community is recognized

and nurtured as a discrete entity, but a state where these two fully functioning communities are brought into cordial interaction.

A Closer Look at Educational R & D and Practice

Any meaningful consideration of what mechanisms might facilitate rapprochement between the communities of educational R & D and educational practice must be based upon information about each community's unique features. Therefore, let's explore each community more fully.

The Educational R & D Community

Educational R & D has been viewed from several interesting perspectives in recent literature. Among these are Richard Schutz' "Where We've Been, Where We Are, and Where We're Going in Educational R & D" (Schutz, 1979), and Sharp and Frankel's "Organizations That Perform Educational R & D: A First Look at the Universe" (Sharp and Frankel, 1979).

Schutz' perspective is one of global personal analysis. While not data-based in the same sense as Sharp and Frankel's, Schutz has conceptualized the historic development of educational R & D in terms of distinct eras. These eras are (a) 1890's to mid-1950's: an era in which R & D "...was an occasional pastime for university professors;" (b) mid-1950's to mid-1960's: an era when R & D became an "organized endeavor"--especially notable were the Cooperative Research Act and course-content improvement efforts of NSF; (c) mid-1960's to early 1970's: an era "...launched by enactment of ESEA of 1965"--especially notable in this era were creation of the Regional Educational Laboratories and R & D Centers and the achievement of initial professional capacity for educational development and for educational evaluation; and (d) early 1970's to 1979: an era described as

"...a dark age in educational R & D in the sense that the medieval era is mistermed 'the dark age of western civilization.'" Especially notable in the fourth era is "...the establishment of enabling conditions for positive characteristics [of educational R & D] to reemerge in a more fundamental and enlightened form" (Schutz, 1979).

Based upon his retrospective analysis of educational R & D, Schutz presents what he considers to be the major accomplishments, which will form the basis for a new era in educational R & D. These accomplishments include (a) the technical and structural elements for a complete R & D system are in place, as is the core technology to support high quality educational practice--at least in elementary education; (b) educational R & D has achieved broad visibility, considerable status, and the scale of R & D now involves units of adequate size and number; and (c) an appropriate sense of time and costs for various forms of R & D payoff has been established. Schutz further contends that educational R & D brings to its impending new era: (a) accountability in the form of identifying in advance what returns will accrue from specific public investment in R & D, and (b) the ability to conduct participatory activity <u>with</u> practitioners, to conduct R & D in an interactive mode rather than as a linear process, and to coordinate research, development, evaluation, and implementation as an integrated set of activities (Schutz, 1979).

Sharp and Frankel report what appears to be the first comprehensive demography of educational R & D in the nation. The following conclusions would seem to be appropriately drawn from the report of findings in their NIE-sponsored study:

(a) <u>Educational R & D comprises a sizable enterprise in the U. S.</u> In 1976-77 expenditures for educational R & D amounted to $734 million and 22,300 persons were employed full-time primarily in this enterprise.

(b) Educational R & D is heavily dependent on federal funds for support. Fifty-three percent of all educational R & D support is derived from federal sources and a quarter of the private sector organizations reported that 95 percent or more of their support came from the federal government.

(c) Educational R & D is performed at some level in a wide array of more than 2,000 organizations; however, only about 200-300 organizations possess the capability for performing a wide variety of R & D. In fact, 80 percent of all expenditures for R & D were made by only 20 percent of the organizations included in the study.

(d) Educational R & D performance is differentiated both in amount and in type among three categories of organizations. Public sector organizations (LEA's, ISA's, and SEA's) account for about 16 percent of the R & D expenditures--their work is oriented heavily to curriculum issues, needs of special students, and analyses of enrollment and other demography of education. Academic sector organizations (colleges and universities) account for about 51 percent of the R & D expenditures -- their work is allocated mainly to traditional learning and curriculum interests. Private sector organizations (profit and nonprofit corporations and others) account for about 33 percent of the R & D expenditures--organizations in this sector tend to address a broad spectrum of topics, including most of the nontraditional R & D.

Finally, Sharp and Frankel note that only in the private sector are large professional staffs from a variety of disciplines and specializations generally found. Based on this finding, they conclude that "...this critical mass of educational researchers...represents an important nucleus of trained manpower which is unmatched elsewhere in organizations doing educational research" (Sharp and Frankel, 1979).

We have now observed educational R & D from two quite different perspectives. First, Schutz' construct of educational R & D's historical development and his broad depiction of its current status was reviewed. Second, a comprehensive demography of educational R & D as depicted by the empirical findings of Sharp and Frankel was briefly reiterated. While any such overview is necessarily limited, I believe these perspectives provide a rich, yet manageable, source of information about the loosely confederated collection of enterprises that I earlier identified as the educational R & D community.

The Community of Educational Practice

Defined earlier as encompassing all forms of institutionalized instruction and attendant mechanisms for their support and control, the community of educational practice contrasts markedly with the educational R & D community. Most Americans, for example, would identify the community of educational practice as the education community. In fact, the community of educational practice is so broad, so visible, so well established in tradition, so direct in its interface with almost our entire population, and so well documented in volumes of descriptive and normative literature that no brief summary seems either possible or necessary. Therefore, my comments on this vast community are very brief.

For our purposes, it seems to matter little whether we adopt a broad or limited view of educational practice--whether, for example, we focus only on the public sector of education or include the private sector as well. Either way, the structure extant for the support, control, and delivery of instruction is one of America's longstanding major enterprises. Given the size and complexity of this community, few generalizations can be universally true. However, the following observations seem to have sufficient generalizability that they may be used as though they were axiomatic.

(1) The overriding purpose of this community is to transmit, from one generation of people to the next, all facets of our culture--its philosophy, religion, knowledge, technology, arts, social practices, and so forth.

(2) This community is recognized and nurtured as a specialized segment of our society to ensure the "transmission of our culture."

(3) The absolute importance of this enterprise to modern society requires such assurance of predictable outcomes that well tested (traditional) means of operation, and a conservative outlook regarding such methods, are almost certain to be pervasive norms among members of this community.

(4) Members of this community are, generally speaking, committed to optimizing the effectiveness of their part in the instructional enterprise.

(5) When exposed to new procedures for accomplishing their work, members of this community are faced with a dilemma: whether to ensure a known outcome by retaining time-tested procedures or to seek a new level of performance by adopting less tradition-proven ways.

Many other perspectives of the educational practice community might be offered. However, I believe these few statements are relatively defensible as generalizations and that they are an adequate characterization of this community for our purposes.

Exploring Mechanisms for Achieving Rapprochement Between R & D and Practice

Whether we employ the descriptions presented above or some different depiction of the R & D and practice communities in education, one cannot help but be struck by their differences. The educational R & D community is characterized as small in numbers of people and material resources; it is limited by a system of values--those of the sciences; it is committed to a limiting concept of knowledge and truth; it is tethered by a prescribed repertoire of methodologies; its identity is one of recent emergence. By contrast, the community of educational practice is characterized as robust in numbers of people and material resources; it encompasses all approaches to values questions; it represents every possible view of knowledge and truth; it instructs in and by a multitude of procedures; it is steeped in the longstanding traditions of a respected social institution.

Juxtaposing these two communities, one sees, in bold relief, their inexorable differences. The curious fact is that some individuals and organizations appear to bridge these differences successfully. They work in, and gain recognition in, both educational R & D and practice. Such behavior might be interpreted as requiring a pathological condition akin to schizophrenia, but

I think not. I believe that such individuals and organizations have--either by intuition or other insight--discovered adaptive mechanisms for living productively in these two worlds. While I find a dearth of literature devoted explicitly to these adaptive mechanisms, I believe we can infer some important information from the literature. From the Sharp and Frankel report on educational R & D, we know that there is a clear differentiation among the organizations performing R & D (Sharp and Frankel, 1979). Academic sector organizations are highly oriented to a fairly limited research agenda. Public sector organizations are heavily oriented to dissemination and evaluation. Private sector organizations--at least the larger ones--engage in a wide variety of research, development, evaluation, and implementation. Sharp and Frankel further observed that only in the private sector are there organizations that have large, multidisciplinary staffs capable of performing a full range of research, development, evaluation, and dissemination (Sharp and Frankel, 1979).

What I infer from this information is that some of the organizations that Sharp and Frankel identified as part of the R & D community may, in fact, not be totally of that community. Instead, it seems possible that a number of the private sector organizations studied really fit into a category that may be thought of as linkage organizations. Is it possible that there has evolved, without public fanfare or overt recognition in the literature, a class of organizations capable of, and may be serving as mechanisms for, achieving rapprochement between the communities of R & D and practice in education? I think that there are.

To support my contention that the necessary mechanisms do exist, but go unrecognized, let's turn once more to the literature. One example is found in a paper entitled "What We May Have Learned About Educational R & D"

soon to be published in Educational Technology. In this paper, John K. Hemphill, longtime director of the Far West Laboratory, explicates ten conclusions he has reached on the basis of his experience. A paraphrase of his conclusions follows:

(1) Educational development is not a panacea--to have utility, it must make many allowances for situational factors.

(2) Participation of the intended user is essential--to succeed, R & D must accept the significant perspectives of practitioners and ensure their sense of "ownership" in outcomes.

(3) Expectations of quick results are unrealistic--programmatic R & D takes time and usually must be supported for 10-15 years to provide meaningful products.

(4) Educational R & D needs protection--the substantial and sustained public investment required for R & D success must be defended as necessary and legitimate by educators generally.

(5) Educational improvement is not a linear process--the research-development/evaluation-dissemination conception is a naive portrayal of a complex, iterative reality.

(6) Most educational improvement is not simple--a multidisciplinary, holistic approach to problem solution is the norm rather than the exception.

(7) Educational systems reject foreign "implants"--the gatekeeper role of educational practice is legitimately and well developed.

(8) Teachers and administrators welcome efforts to improve education--but R & D must respect the real world conditions that practitioners face and accord parity to their perspective.

(9) The impact of educational R & D is difficult to determine--impact assessment is a long-term task fraught with often unanticipated complexities.

(10) Methodology for the conduct of educational R & D faces serious problems--practical constraints of dealing with human subjects often limit the feasibility of employing "hard" sciences and classical R & D methods.

With apology to Hemphill for any violence I may have done in paraphrasing his conclusions, I think these statements represent an atypical perspective--one that is neither that of the typical educational researcher nor that of the typical educational practitioner. How many educational researchers will, so

readily as Hemphill, concede the dysfunctions of classical scientific methodology? How many educational practitioners are ready to abandon their skepticism about the benefits of educational R & D to practice? In other words, I believe that Hemphill's observations will be agreeable to only that relatively small group of people who devote themselves to linking educational R & D and practice through the application of technology-- the people who inhabit at least some of those large private sector organizations identified by Sharp and Frankel.

Another example from the literature, which I believe supports my contention about differentiation among organizations customarily identified with the R & D community, was reported earlier. Schutz in his "Where We've Been, Where We Are, and Where We're Going in Educational R & D" also, I believe, displays an atypical view of R & D. While he purports to be describing the educational R & D community as a whole, his perspective appears abhorrent. His emphasis is clearly focused upon the capacity of educational R & D to effect improvement in educational practice. This perspective is sharply at odds with more typical reports about the values of educational R & D.*

What I am attempting to demonstrate here is that there already exists, in the form of a group of organizations, the mechanism for achieving purposive rapprochement between the communities of educational R & D and practice. Further, if Schutz' optimistic assessment is accurate, we can assert that much of the capacity for achieving the needed linkage is already in place. If the mechanism for achieving rapprochement between R & D and practice does exist, as I have asserted, in the form of a group of atypical, private sector organizations often erroneously identified as part of the R & D community, we see that one step toward solution of the problem cited in 1963 by Clark is solved.

---

*See, for example, Kerlinger's "The Influence of Research on Educational Practice" (Kerlinger, 1977).

But if the mechanisms for linkage do exist, why have we not seen dramatic, technological changes sweeping through the community of educational practice? Two explanations appear probable. First, the linking organizations of the private sector are only now reaching maturity; therefore, their potential has not yet become realized in practice. Second, while the linking organizations are large by educational R & D community standards, they are miniscule by the size standards of educational practice; thus, their direct impact on practice is very limited.

From the foregoing observations, I believe we are finally in a position to speak directly to the topic "Educational R & D: A Role for Leadership in Professional Associations."

Meaningful Roles for Professional Associations

To this point, I have provided a conception of the educational enterprise that I have not found explicated elsewhere. Beginning with Clark's assertion that the critical problem of improving education through R & D technology was the need for mechanisms to join research and practice, I set out to describe how the problem might be solved. In doing so, I have offered a conception of the education enterprise which posits two relatively discrete and insular communities: an R & D community and a community of practice. Supporting the veracity of this conception on the basis of necessarily divergent norms, I suggested that merger of these two communities would be undesirable, if not impossible. The observation was then offered that there has evolved, almost unnoticed, a group of private sector organizations, which do serve as mechanisms for rapprochement between educational R & D and practice. Finally, I have argued that the hoped for improvement in educational practice on the basis of R & D technology has not yet been achieved because these linkage organizations

are just now reaching maturity and because their size and number is insufficient to directly impact more than a tiny fraction of the massive community of educational practice. While my approach has been admittedly circuitous, I think we now have a conception of the education enterprise from which meaningful roles for professional associations can be inferred.

Like trade associations in business, all of the professional associations in education have, as their principal purpose, the advancement of one or more special interests. These associations have been created by individuals and/or organizations banding together to protect and foster their members' particular concerns. However, the myriad of professional associations in education, I believe, have one unique purpose in common. That purpose is the improvement of educational practice. If this common-purpose assumption approximates reality, then we might expect that almost all professional associations in education would be willing to expend some energy to enhance the development of R & D technology and to assure its use for the improvement of practice. Therefore, my consideration of meaningful roles for professional associations need not address the associations' differences, but it can assume almost universal support for this common purpose.

What, then, are the major strengths possessed by professional associations that might be tapped in support of the common purpose? In a word, I believe that the answer is "influence." Almost everyone in education is represented, either directly through individual membership or indirectly through institutional membership, by one or more professional associations. And the number of people involved in education represents a sizable portion of this nation's population. Therefore, considered as a group, professional associations have a tremendous capacity to influence almost all persons in the education enterprise and, conversely, to influence public policy.

How, then, can this tremendous capacity to influence be harnessed to achieve the associations' common purpose? I would, now, like to identify a number of roles through which professional associations might take leadership, roles through which the influence of professional associations might be systematically applied to achieve improvement in educational practice through R & D technology.

Role One: Informing members of a more utilitarian conception of R & D and and practice in education. The idea of a "theory-practice gap" in education is well entrenched. The result is almost universal acceptance, among both researchers and practitioners, that contention between research and practice is a necessary and permanent state. But the conception of a "theory-practice gap" is based upon an outmoded and naive assumption about the linear progression of technological change from research--to development and evaluation--to dissemination--to practice. While this assumption has long been known to be fallacious, the research-practice contention it fostered remains both real and pervasive. Therefore, one seminal role for professional associations is for them to use their influence to inform their members that there is a more productive reality: that technology is an iterative process, that both research and practice have important roles in technological development, and that the contention fostered by a mythical theory-practice gap is both counterproductive and unnecessary. Such action on the part of professional associations would serve to legitimize the inherent differences in values and norms held by the research and practice communities. It would encourage mutual regard between researchers and practitioners, and it would foster strong support for those private sector organizations that link research and practice.

The tremendous capacity that professional associations have to inform and influence their members could, in a very short time, refocus the energies of

educators from the wasteful and destructive contention that now exists between research and practice toward a new state of mutual regard and support. If professional associations chose to use their communication networks to influence their members in this way, it would be effected with no diminution of their primary purpose as special interest groups.

Role Two: Informing public policy to support a more realistic view of R & D and practice. In their primary capacity as special interest groups in education, professional associations have a dramatic impact on public policy--not the least of which is the exercise of considerable control over how government funds are expended. To say that the leaders of these associations are familiar with state and federal government decision-making apparatus seems an understatement. But because of the longstanding contention between research and practice in education, those associations identified mainly with educational practice have not, generally speaking, exercised an influence proportionate to their membership regarding the nation's R & D agenda. Instead, a very few associations--AERA being the most notable--and a comparative handful of federal agency personnal have had a relatively free hand in establishing public policy for educational R & D. By adopting a less contentious conception of R & D and practice, such as the one presented here, associations identified mainly with educational practice would legitimize their role in exercising influence over R & D agendas relevant to their concerns for practice. Such actions would provide the kind of pluralistic mechanism so often called for, but conspicuously absent, in establishing public policy for educational R & D.

Role Three: Supporting R & D technology as a critical ingredient for improving educational practice. If educational research and educational practice are recognized as discrete communities that legitimately cleave to disparate

norms and values, the need for mechanisms to achieve rapprochement is evident. Otherwise, one must assume that practice will not be improved on the basis of new knowledge. Rejecting this assumption, it becomes incumbent on both researchers and practitioners to recognize and support mechanisms designed to link their communities. The mechanisms for linkage that seem to have emerged, almost unnoticed, are the large private sector organizations capable of producing the technology through which educational practice can be meaningfully improved. Production of such technology requires a unique interface of researchers and practitioners in a nontraditional environment where the knowledge and values of science and the wisdom and experience of practice are all accorded primary importance. Since such organizations apparently have not developed in either the academic (research) or public (practice) sectors, it seems reasonable to conclude that they are not compatible with either of these traditional environments. Therefore, if the very mechanism for linking educational research and practice is to exist and flourish, professional associations--whether oriented to research or practice--must nurture these linking organizations.

The role of nurturing these linking organizations requires several actions on the part of professional associations. First, the reconceptualization of the educational enterprise must be communicated as suggested in Role One. Second, the nurture of these organizations is especially dependent on support from the federal government--a public policy issue related to Role Two. Third, identification of the areas most fruitful for, and most in need of, attention by these linking organizations might be best communicated through associations of the research and practice communities--another issue of public policy. Finally, professional associations seem to be the most natural vehicles for communicating information about the emergence of new technology to their members--this

dissemination activity is especially important, I believe, in the community of educational practice.

In conclusion, I would observe that American education is currently being buffeted by a multitude of social forces. There are increasing pressures for what often are seen to be conflicting demands for accomplishment--back to the basics, competency testing for kids and teachers, proposition 13, and so forth. Given this reality, we in education face a dramatic challenge--a challenge to improve educational practice. Any response based on "more of what is" will be rejected. Any response based on "conventional wisdom" seems doomed to failure. Our best chance for responding acceptably appears to involve improving educational practice through technology derived from merging new knowledge with practical wisdom. However, I do not believe that such improvement can or will evolve naturally. What I have tried to describe here are three seminal roles through which professional associations might take a leadership initiative unprecedented in American education. I believe that the exercise of such leadership by our professional associations would provide the very instrument of pluralistic, yet integrated, guidance so much needed in these times of uncertainty.

As a stimulus for action, I shall close my remarks with a quotation from a recent article by W. James Popham (Popham, 1980):

> ...I believe that the past 20 years saw the emergence of an instructional technology which, albeit imperfect, is enormously potent. Unfortunately, the potent technology demands more resources than our nation currently seems inclined to expend. I suspect that a series of unseen events must transpire before we find ourselves again in a position to create the technically sound sorts of replicable instructional sequences which will yield dramatic benefits for learners. That we can do it, I have no doubt.

I believe that the power to achieve what Popham describes can become a reality through firm leadership by our professional associations in education.

References

Clark, David L. "Educational Research: A National Perspective." In Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley (eds.), Educational Research: New Perspectives. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1963.

Eidell, Terry L. AEL Plan for 1978-82. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1977, pp. 5-9.

Hemphill, John K. "What We May Have Learned About Educational R & D." Educational Technology, forthcoming.

Kerlinger, Fred N. "The Influence of Research on Education Practice." Educational Researcher, September 1977.

Popham, W. James. "Two Decades of Educational Technology." Educational Technology, January 1980.

Schutz, Richard E. "Where We've Been, Where We Are, and Where We're Going in Educational R & D." Educational Researcher, September 1979.

Sharp, Laure M. and Frankel, Joanne. "Organizations That Perform Educational R & D: A First Look at the Universe." Educational Researcher, December 1979.